



# SIG 1003(g) Scoring Rubric

<b>School:</b>		<b>Reviewer:</b>		<b>Date:</b>	
<b>Part 1: Grantee Information</b>					<b>Part 1: Grantee Information Notes</b>
<b>Inadequate – 1 point</b>	<b>Adequate – 2 points</b>	<b>Excellent – 3 points</b>		<b>Score</b>	
Missing two or more areas of information	Missing one area of information	All areas of information complete			
		Total			
<b>Part 2: LEA and School Assurances and Waivers</b>					<b>Part 2: LEA and School Assurances and Waivers Notes</b>
<b>Inadequate – 1 point</b>	<b>Adequate – 2 points</b>	<b>Excellent – 3 points</b>			
Missing two or more assurances	Missing one assurance	All areas of assurances complete			
Staff Members Consulted do not include anyone outside of the building	Staff Members Consulted only includes one central office staff member	Staff Members Consulted includes two or more central office staff members from different areas of central office			
Consultation with stakeholders included at least one meeting with parents and/or community members	Consultation with stakeholders included at least one meeting with parents AND community members	Consultation with stakeholders included multiple meetings with parents AND community members			
Basic description of how both family and/or community input was taken into account when selecting the chosen intervention - addresses two or less of the questions from the application	Clear description of how both family AND community input was taken into account when selecting the chosen intervention - three questions from application are addressed	Clear and detailed description of how both family AND community input was taken into account when selecting the chosen intervention - all questions from application are addressed			
		Total			
<b>Part 3: Schools to be Served by LEA</b>					<b>Part 3: Schools to be Served by LEA Notes</b>
<b>Inadequate – 1 point</b>	<b>Adequate – 2 points</b>	<b>Excellent – 3 points</b>			

Missing multiple eligible schools, or missing multiple explanations/capacity to serve	Missing eligible school, or missing explanation/capacity to serve	All eligible schools are accounted for and models selected, or explanation given for why LEA does not have capacity to serve			
		Total			
<b>Part 4: Needs Assessment and Goals</b>					<b>Part 4: Needs Assessment and Goals Notes</b>
<b>Inadequate – 1 point</b>	<b>Adequate – 2 points</b>	<b>Excellent – 3 points</b>			
<i>Subgroup Achievement Indicators:</i> Multiple subgroups listed on COMPASS NCLB data are not addressed for both ELA and Math OR goals do not seem reasonable and logical based on data provided	<i>Subgroup Achievement Indicators:</i> All but one subgroup listed on COMPASS NCLB data are addressed for both ELA and Math AND goals seem reasonable and logical based on data provided	<i>Subgroup Achievement Indicators:</i> All subgroups listed on COMPASS NCLB data are addressed for both ELA and Math AND goals seem reasonable and logical based on data provided			
<i>Overall Achievement Indicators:</i> Multiple tested grade levels or areas is not included OR goals do not seem reasonable and logical based on data provided	<i>Overall Achievement Indicators:</i> Data for all but one tested grade level or area is included AND goals seem reasonable and logical based on data provided	<i>Overall Achievement Indicators:</i> Data for all tested grade levels is included AND goals seem reasonable and logical based on data provided			
<i>Student Leading Indicators:</i> Three or more areas of the required data sources are missing OR goals do not seem reasonable and logical based on the data provided	<i>Student Leading Indicators:</i> No more than two areas of the required data sources are missing AND goals reasonable and logical based on the data provided	<i>Student Leading Indicators:</i> All required data sources have been provided AND all goals seem reasonable and logical based on the data provided			

<i>Instructional Programs, School Leadership, and School Infrastructure:</i> little or no use of analysis and/or causes are illogical and not based on data. The alignment of the school, its needs, and the improvement model chosen is lacking or minimal in the justification portion. Subgroups of students are not a part of the focus of change.	<i>Instructional Programs, School Leadership, and School Infrastructure:</i> Some of the analysis (findings) from the data and goals and interventions seem accurate. A general alignment between the needs of the school and the model chosen has been demonstrated in the justification portion. Subgroups of students are a part of the focus of change.	<i>Instructional Programs, School Leadership, and School Infrastructure:</i> All of the analysis (findings) from the data and the goals and interventions are logical. The alignment between the needs of the school and the model chosen is specifically and conclusively demonstrated as appropriate in the justification portion. Subgroups of students are a clear part of the focus of change.			
		Total			

Part 5: Selection of Intervention Model					Part 5: Selection of Intervention Model Notes
Inadequate – 1 point	Adequate – 2 points	Excellent – 3 points			
Model chosen	Model chosen	Model chosen			
Rationale minimally covers how the model corresponds to the data, findings, analysis, and self-assessment.	Rationale is clear, concise, and covers some areas of how the model corresponds to the data, findings, analysis, and self-assessment.	Rationale is clear, concise, and covers all areas of how the model corresponds to the data, findings, analysis, and self-assessment.			
Connection to subgroup data is not included or does not align with subgroup data presented in needs assessment section.	Connection to subgroup data is included and aligns with subgroup data presented in needs assessment section.	Connection to subgroup data is evident, clear, concise, and aligns with subgroup data presented in needs assessment section.			
Connection to overall achievement data is not included or does not align with data presented in needs assessment section.	Connection to overall achievement data is included, and aligns with data presented in needs assessment section.	Connection to overall achievement data is evident, clear, concise, and aligns with data presented in needs assessment section.			

Connection to leading indicators is is not included or does not align with data presented in needs assessment section.	Connection to leading indicators is included, and aligns with data presented in needs assessment section.	Connection to leading indicators is evident, clear, concise, and aligns with subgroup data presented in needs assessment section.			
Description does not include ways in which the model will cover areas of teacher, principal, and student change in the building.	Description includes some ways in which the model will cover teacher, principal, and student change in the building.	Description includes clear and complete ways in which the model will cover all areas of teacher, principal, and student change in the building.			
<b>Model Goals, Planning, Implementation, and Sustainability Outlines</b>					<b>Outline Notes</b>
<b>Models</b>	<b>Inadequate – 1 point</b>	<b>Adequate – 2 points</b>	<b>Excellent – 3 points</b>		
<b>ALL MODELS:</b> <i>SMART Culture Goal</i>	SMART goal is missing multiple areas – specific, measurable, attainable, realistic, and timely – and/or are not aligned to the needs of school.	SMART goal is missing one area – specific, measurable, attainable, realistic, and timely - and is aligned to the needs of school.	SMART goal covers all areas – specific, measurable, attainable, realistic, and timely - and is aligned to the needs of school.		
<b>ALL MODELS:</b> <i>SMART Academic Goals</i>	SMART goals are not provided for ELA and Math, are missing multiple areas – specific, measurable, attainable, realistic, and timely – and/or are not aligned to the needs of school.	SMART goals are provided for both ELA and Math, but are missing one area – specific, measurable, attainable, realistic, and timely. SMART goals are aligned to the needs of school.	SMART goals are provided for both ELA and Math, cover all areas – specific, measurable, attainable, realistic, and timely - and are aligned to the needs of school.		
<b>ALL MODELS:</b> <i>Planning Year</i>	Each focus area has at least one action steps for each phase of the timeline OR descriptions add limited pieces of information to development of plan.	Each focus area has at least two action steps for each phase of the timeline AND description adds key pieces of information to development of plan.	Each focus area has at least three action steps for each phase of the timeline AND description adds key pieces of information to development of plan.		

<b>ALL MODELS: Leadership</b>	Plan is missing multiple elements regarding required and/or IN conditions	ALL Required and all but one IN Condition is clearly met within plan	ALL Required and IN Conditions are clearly met within plan		
<b>ALL MODELS: District Support</b>	Plan is missing multiple elements regarding requirements and/or IN conditions OR pieces submitted were not detailed	All required pieces and all but one IN conditions have been submitted, are detailed and address most needs of the school	All required pieces and IN conditions have been submitted, are focused, relevant, and detailed, and address all needs of the school		
<b>Transformation , Turnaround, Early Learning: Evaluation Systems</b>	Evaluation systems for principal and teachers do not include an assessment aligned to student academic growth OR incentives and leadership opportunities for staff are not included in plan	Evaluation systems for principal and teachers includes a single assessment aligned to student academic growth or clear incentives and leadership opportunities for staff are not evident in plan	Evaluation systems for principal and teachers includes multiple assessments aligned to student academic growth and clear incentives and leadership opportunities for staff are included in plan		
<b>Transformation &amp; Turnaround: Increased learning time for students and staff</b>	Does not provide increased learning time for all students and staff, time is not of sufficient length, and involves only a select number of students/staff, OR all IN conditions are not included in plan	Provides increased learning time for all students and staff, time is of extended, onsite or virtual, and involves most students/staff, and all IN conditions are included in plan	Provides increased, intentional learning time driven by student data indicated for all students and staff, time is of extensive, onsite, and involves all students/staff, and all IN conditions have clear descriptions in plan		
<b>Early Learning Model: Instructional Reform and Programing</b>	Description of how child to staff ratio, class size, and full-day programming not included OR does not meet any of the requirements, OR all IN conditions are not included in plan	Description of how child to staff ratio, class size, and full-day programming are included, detailed, but do not fully meet requirement, and all IN conditions are included in plan	Description of how child to staff ratio, class size, and full-day programming are included, detailed, and specifically meet requirements, and all IN conditions have clear descriptions in plan		

<b>Whole School Reform and IN Leadership: External Provider or Strategy Developer</b>	School has partnered with strategy developer or external partner who will support whole school reform or leadership model, but has not provided sufficient scope of work, goals, or objectives.	School has partnered with strategy developer or external partner who will support whole school reform or leadership model. Scopes of work, goals, and objectives have been included. Rationale behind chosen provider has been included.	School has partnered with strategy developer or external partner who will support whole school reform or leadership model. Scope of work, goals, and objectives have been included and are detailed. Rationale behind chosen provider has been included. Provider has proven track record.		
<b>Whole School Reform: Reform Model</b>	School has chosen a model from the USED approved list, but does not provide rationale OR rationale is not linked to school data.	School has chosen a model from the USED approved list and gives some rationale behind choosing this model. Rationale is somewhat linked to school data.	School has chosen a model from the USED approved list and gives clear and detailed rationale behind choosing this model. Rationale is linked to school data.		
<b>Restart: Enrollment</b>	No clear enrollment plan is included	General enrollment plan for students is included	Clear and detailed enrollment plan for all students, including any former student, is included		
<b>Restart: Management Selection</b>	LEA submission of charter, CMO, or EMO request and selection process does not include data in relation to charter, CMO, or EMOs past record of: improvement in academic achievement for all students, success in closing the achievement gap for all groups of students, high school graduation rates (where applicable), and compliance issues.	LEA submission of charter, CMO, or EMO request and selection process is missing data for one of the following areas in relation to charter, CMO, or EMOs past record of: improvement in academic achievement for all students, success in closing the achievement gap for all groups of students, high school graduation rates (where applicable), and compliance issues.	LEA submission of charter, CMO, or EMO request and selection process includes data in relation to charter, CMO, or EMOs past record of: improvement in academic achievement for all students, success in closing the achievement gap for all groups of students, high school graduation rates (where applicable), and compliance issues.		

<b>ALL MODELS: Remaining principles</b>	All principles with required pieces or IN conditions are not meeting the requirements. Some of the principles with optional pieces are implementing some interventions from the provided and approved list.	All principles with required pieces and IN conditions have a detailed description of how requirements will be implemented. All principles with optional intervention pieces will implement at least one intervention from the provided and approved list.	All principles with required pieces and IN conditions have a detailed description of how requirements will be implemented. All principles with optional intervention pieces are implementing at least two interventions from the provided and approved list.		
<b>ALL MODELS: Sustainability Year</b>	Each focus area has at least one action steps for each phase of the timeline OR descriptions add limited pieces of information to development of plan.	Each focus area has at least two action steps for each phase of the timeline AND description adds key pieces of information to development of plan.	Each focus area has at least three action steps for each phase of the timeline AND description adds key pieces of information to development of plan.		
<b>*CLOSURE will only be scored on Planning Year</b>					
		Total			
<b>Part 6: Outcome Artifact</b>					<b>Part 6: Outcome Artifact Notes</b>
<b>Inadequate – 1 point</b>	<b>Adequate – 2 points</b>	<b>Excellent – 3 points</b>			
Outcome is vague, somewhat aligned to goals of SIG grant, but does not revolve around one of the key areas of leadership, effective instruction, or interventions/data.	Outcome is clear, aligned to goals of SIG grant, and/or revolves around one of the key areas of leadership, effective instruction, or interventions/data.	Outcome is focused, aligned to goals of SIG grant, and revolves around one of the key areas of leadership, effective instruction, or interventions/data.			
		Total			
<b>Part 7: LEA Capacity to Implement the Improvement Model</b>					<b>Part 7: LEA Capacity to Implement the Improvement Model Notes</b>
<b>Inadequate – 1 point</b>	<b>Adequate – 2 points</b>	<b>Excellent – 3 points</b>			
<b>LEA Capacity Tasks</b>					

Evidence of projected budgets are in-sufficient or excessive in supporting the full and effective implementation of the intervention for five years. Projected budgets do not meet all fiscal requirements, being reasonable, allocable, and necessary, and do not effectively plan for sustainability after funding ends.	Evidence of projected budgets are in-sufficient OR excessive in supporting the full and effective implementation of the intervention for five years, while meeting most fiscal requirements, being mostly reasonable, allocable, and necessary, and planning for sustainability after funding ends.	Evidence of projected budgets are sufficient and appropriate to support the full and effective implementation of the intervention for five years, while meeting all fiscal requirements, being reasonable, allocable, and necessary, and clearly planning for sustainability after funding ends.			
The evidence submitted shows the School Board, Superintendent, and teacher's union are not fully committed to eliminating barriers to allow for full implementation of the model chosen. It is not clear that a five-year commitment is being made by ALL of integral stakeholders within the district - LEA, building, superintendent, school board, union.	The evidence submitted shows the School Board, Superintendent, and teacher's union are only partially committed to eliminating barriers to allow for full implementation of the model chosen. It is clear that a five-year commitment is being made by most of integral stakeholders within the district - LEA, building, superintendent, school board, union.	The evidence submitted shows the School Board, Superintendent, and teacher's union are fully committed to eliminating barriers to allow for full implementation of the model chosen. It is evident that a five-year commitment is being made by ALL integral stakeholders within the district - LEA, building, superintendent, school board, union.			



The process submitted for selecting building staff is not clear and does not involve multiple parties within the district. LEA and administrative staff have credentials or have a demonstrated track record for transformation/turnaround work.	The process submitted for selecting building staff is lacking rigor, clarity, and/or multiple parties within the district. LEA and administrative staff have credentials and/or have a demonstrated track record for transformation/turnaround work.	The process submitted for selecting building staff is rigorous, clear, and involves multiple parties within the district. LEA and administrative staff have credentials and have a demonstrated track record for transformation/turnaround work.			
District staff does not have an outlined process for monitoring and supporting the implementation of the selected improvement model.	District staff has vaguely outlined a process for monitoring and supporting the implementation of the selected improvement model.	District staff has clearly outlined a process for monitoring and supporting the implementation of the selected improvement model.			
There is inadequate evidence of a process for modifying practices and policies to enable full and effective implementation of the selected model, interventions, and/or school improvement activities.	There is adequate evidence of a process for modifying practices and policies to enable full and effective implementation of the selected model, interventions, and/or school improvement activities.	There is exceptional evidence of a process for modifying practices and policies to enable full and effective implementation of the selected model, interventions, and/or school improvement activities.			
<b>LEA Risk Assessment Tasks</b>					
District responds "yes" to numbers 1 - 4 of Risk Assessment and submits a plan for implementation for each area, including staff who will be involved OR District has not responded "yes" to one or more of the statements in numbers 1 - 4.	District responds "yes" to numbers 1 - 4 of Risk Assessment and submits a basic plan for area, including staff who will be involved.	District responds "yes" to numbers 1 - 4 of Risk Assessment and submits a clear, concise plan for each area, including staff who will be involved.			

District responds yes to number 5 and provides no details or explanation.	District responds yes to number 5 with little details about changes and updates to previous plans.	District responds yes to number 5 with clear explanation of how current application is different from previous applications and how district support will be in place.			
District has not had a SBOA or Onsite Consolidated Federal Monitoring visit in the last three years and has not provided documentation of LEA monitoring protocol (number 7).	District has not had a SBOA or Onsite Consolidated Federal Monitoring visit in the last three years, but has provided some documentation of LEA monitoring protocol (number 7).	District has not had a SBOA or Onsite Consolidated Federal Monitoring visit in the last three years, but has provided detailed documentation of LEA monitoring protocol (number 7).			
District has marked yes number 6 and/or 8 and has not provided sufficient evidence in procedural changes to be in compliance.	District has marked yes number 6 and/or 8 and has provided some evidence in procedural changes to be in compliance.	District has not had findings or been in excess carryover (numbers 6 and 8) OR has marked yes to these statements, but has provided detailed evidence in procedural changes to be in compliance.			
		Total			
<b>Part 8: Selection of External Providers</b>					<b>Part 8: Selection of External Providers Notes</b>
<b>Inadequate – 1 point</b>	<b>Adequate – 2 points</b>	<b>Excellent – 3 points</b>			
There is inadequate evidence of a process for recruiting, screening, and selecting an external provider.	There is adequate evidence of a process for recruiting, screening, and selecting an external provider.	There is exceptional evidence of a process for recruiting, screening, and selecting an external provider.			

Some or none of the decisive factors regarding the process for recruiting, screening and selecting an external provider are addressed and inadequately explained - - provider's commitment, provider's ability to meet school needs, alignment of selection with LEA and school resources, assessment of services.	Most of the decisive factors regarding the process for recruiting, screening and selecting an external provider are addressed and adequately explained - - provider's commitment, provider's ability to meet school needs, alignment of selection with LEA and school resources, assessment of services.	All of the decisive factors regarding the process for recruiting, screening, and selecting an external provider are addressed and thoroughly explained - provider's commitment, provider's ability to meet school needs, alignment of selection with LEA and school resources, assessment of services.			
The plan is not consistent with the final requirements and the process for recruiting, screening, and selecting an external provider does not meet the identified needs.	Minor changes are needed to the LEA process for recruiting, screening, and selecting an external provider to meet the needs identified.	The LEA includes a comprehensive process for recruiting, screening and selecting an external provider to meet the needs identified.			
The LEA includes inadequate expectations for the external provider in reference to: assessing the services, including, but not limited to: communication, sources of data used to evaluate effectiveness, monitoring of records, in-school presence, recording and reporting of progress with the selected service provider(s) to ensure that supports are taking place and are adjusted according to the school's identified needs.	The LEA includes adequate expectations for the external provider in reference to: assessing the services, including, but not limited to: communication, sources of data used to evaluate effectiveness, monitoring of records, in-school presence, recording and reporting of progress with the selected service provider(s) to ensure that supports are taking place and are adjusted according to the school's identified needs.	The LEA includes exceptional expectations for the external provider in reference to: assessing the services, including, but not limited to: communication, sources of data used to evaluate effectiveness, monitoring of records, in-school presence, recording and reporting of progress with the selected service provider(s) to ensure that supports are taking place and are adjusted according to the school's identified needs.			

Scope of work OR summary of school expectations not provided. OR Scope of work or summary of school expectations is provided but it does not reflect goals of grant.	Scope of work is provided and somewhat reflects goals presented in grant OR scope of work is promised and summary of school expectations which somewhat reflects goals of grant is provided.	Scope of work is provided and reflects goals presented in grant OR scope of work is promised and summary of school expectations which reflects goals of grant is provided.			
		Total			
<b>Part 9: Budget</b>					<b>Part 9: Budget Notes</b>
<b>Inadequate – 1 point</b>	<b>Adequate – 2 points</b>	<b>Excellent – 3 points</b>			
<b>Expenditures in budget are aligned with grant goals and federal requirements.</b>					<b>Expenditures in budget are aligned with grant goals and federal requirements.</b>
Little or no expenditures are reasonable, allowable, or necessary.	Some expenditures are reasonable, allowable, and necessary.	Expenditures are reasonable, allowable, and necessary.			
Few, if any, expenditures are aligned with the activities and goals of the grant.	Some expenditures are aligned with the activities and goals of the grant.	Expenditures are aligned with the activities and goals of the grant.			
Budget focuses more on items for building than interventions and change that could build sustainable practices.	Budget focuses on interventions and change that could build sustainable practices, as well as purchasing items for building - mostly balanced combination of staff, professional development, training, etc. and technology, supplies, materials, etc.	Budget clearly focuses on interventions and change that will build sustainable practices - mostly staff, professional development, training, etc.; little to no funds are focused on purchasing items for building - technology, supplies, materials, etc.			
Budget demonstrates no reduction in funding, internal capacity building or sustainability over time.	Budget demonstrates some reduction in funding as internal capacity is built and sustained over time.	Budget demonstrates gradual reduction as internal capacity is built and sustained over time.			

Expenditures could be considered supplanting (expenditures are also included in Basic Title I Budget, or are responsibility of district).	Some expenditure may be considered supplanting (some expenditure are also included in Basic Title I Budget, or are responsibility of district).	Expenditures are not considered supplanting (expenditures are not included in Basic Title I Budget, or are not responsibility of district).			
Capital Expenses in budget are not in compliance with 34 C.F.R. § 76.533 (construction), 34 C.F.R. § 77.1(c) (minor building alterations), Title I, Part A (see B-7) (rewiring).	Capital Expenses in budget may not be in compliance with 34 C.F.R. § 76.533 (construction), 34 C.F.R. § 77.1(c) (minor building alterations), Title I, Part A (see B-7) (rewiring).	Capital Expenses in budget are in compliance with 34 C.F.R. § 76.533 (construction), 34 C.F.R. § 77.1(c) (minor building alterations), Title I, Part A (see B-7) (rewiring).			
<b>Align other resources with the interventions.</b>					<b>Align other resources with the interventions.</b>
There is inadequate evidence of a process for aligning resources with the selected model, interventions, and/or school improvement activities.	There is adequate evidence of a process for aligning resources with the selected model, interventions, and/or school improvement activities.	There is exceptional evidence of a process for aligning resources with the selected model, interventions, and/or school improvement activities.			
The plan is not consistent with the final requirements and the process for aligning resources with the selected model, interventions, and/or school improvement activities does not meet the identified needs.	Minor changes are needed to the LEA process for aligning resources with the selected model, interventions, and/or school improvement activities to meet the needs identified.	The LEA includes a comprehensive process for aligning resources with the selected model, interventions, and/or school improvement activities to meet the needs identified.			
<b>Sustain the reforms after the funding period ends.</b>					<b>Sustain the reforms after the funding period ends.</b>
There is inadequate evidence of a process for sustaining reforms after the funding period ends.	There is adequate evidence of a process for sustaining reforms after the funding period ends.	There is exceptional evidence of a process for sustaining reforms after the funding period ends.			

The plan is not consistent with the final requirements and the process for sustaining reforms after the funding period ends does not meet the identified needs.	Minor changes are needed to the LEA process for sustaining reforms after the funding period ends to meet the identified needs.	The LEA includes a comprehensive process for sustaining reforms after the funding period ends to meet the identified needs.			
		Total			
		Grand Total		0	
Additional Notes					